REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated April 6, 2009. It is brought to the Examiner's attention that only one month was provided for the filing of a response to a substantive Office Action based on the merits and it is requested that an additional two month time, as normally provided, be provided to applicant should additional or supplementary responses be necessary.

Claims 1-14, 16-25, and 27-30 are in the application, with claims 15 and 26 having been canceled.

Claims 4-25 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Examiner asserted that: (1) claims 4 and 5 do not further limit claim 1 and claims 3 and 5 are duplicates, (2) claims 6 and 7 are unclear, (3) claim 15 does not further limit claims 1 and 4, (4) claims 16 and 20 do not further limit claim 1, are duplicates of other claims and that no corresponding structure is disclosed, (5) claim 24 conflicts with claim 1, and (6) claim 25 is unclear with respect to the meaning of the term "body".

Preliminarily, it is submitted that the "rotational axis" as used in the claims is the central axis around which the rotor is rotated, i.e., the vertical center-line of the filtering apparatus as shown in Figure 1. The "direction of rotational axis" as used in the claims is the vertical center line or lines parallel thereto. The "circumferential direction" as used in the claims is the rotational direction in which the rotor rotates.

With these definitions in mind, and with reference to the above rejections:

1. Claim 1 specifies that the first and second blades are at different vertical positions (i.e., in a direction of the rotational axis) and are not in the same plane. Claims 4 and 5 further delimit claim 1 by specifying that first and second blades are at circumferentially different positions (i.e., are not vertically co-incident or as in claim 5 are only partially overlapped). Claim 3 specifies that first and second blades, in vertically separated planes are fully overlapped with each other. Claims 3 and 5 thus properly structurally differ and are not duplicates;

2. Claim 6 clearly specifies that the first and second, vertically separated blades, do not overlap with each other in the vertical direction, i.e., circumferentially completely offset from

each other (as opposed to claim 5 which specifies a partial overlap). Claim 7 specifies that the distance of circumferential offset is equal between the first and second blades.

3. The rejection of claim 15 has been rendered moot by the cancellation thereof.

4. Claim 16, as amended, specifies that the vertically spaced first and second blades overlap with each other and that at least one protrusion is disposed between the first and second blades (clearly shown in Figures 15, 19 and 20). The protrusions are shown on one of the blades and are positioned according to the claim 16 limitation. Which blade they protrude from is irrelevant to the structure which requires only that they be positioned between the blades for turbulence purposes. Claim 16, is clear in scope and differs from all the other claims. Claim 20, dependent on claim 17, properly specifies the horizontal cross section of the circular protrusion.

5. Claim 24 specifies that the first and second rotor are attached to each other. This does not precludes placement of a membrane therebetween. Attachment is not a full integration and they may be attached centrally or with other limited connecting members which do not impede placement of a membrane therebetween.

6. The Examiner's rejection of claim 25 has been rendered moot by the deletion of the term "body" and the specifying that the first and second rotor are formed integrally.

All the claims are definite and the Examiner is requested to review and withdraw the rejection thereof based on 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-25 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki (US 4,066,546) and/or Henttonen et al (US 6,027,656), and/or Huebel (sic)(US 5,925,247) and/or Rolchigo et al. (US 5,993,674).

Sasaki was cited as showing rotor discs with vanes which the Examiner equated with blades. The Examiner cited Figure 7 thereof as showing vanes. However, reference numeral 214, cited by the Examiner is actually a plurality of projections (col 12, lines 12-16) and they are not separations which would form "vanes" . Sasaki shows only full disks and no blades or vanes as asserted by the Examiner. The present invention, as claimed in claim 1, has vertically separated first and second blades which have a specific interaction with respect to turbulence. The Henttonen et al. reference simply shows a single diameter blade in a single plane. There is no teaching, even under the "KSR" decision cited for one skilled in the art to provide an interactive dual layer set of blades. The Huebbel reference also shows a single disk, albeit perforated, and not

any sepated blades. Similarly, the Rolchigo reference show a single disk with spiral grooves and no blades (see cross section view, Figure 4) or even vanes as contended by the Examiner. The references, whether taken alone or in combination do not and cannot provide the presently claimed invention of first and second plurality of blades extending in a radial direction and which are vertically separated in a direction of the rotational axis. Furthermore, the cited references which do not show blades at all (or even vanes) cannot meet the limitations of the dependent claims of differing blade widths (e.g., claims 2 and 14). Furthermore, even in combination with the Hentonnen el reference with a single blade, a combination does not provide overlapping relationships between blades (e.g., claims 3-14, 16-21) .

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING SYSTEM ON MAY 6, 2009

MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK FABER LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700